

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCI United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

DATE MAILED: 05/19/2005

APPLICATION NO. ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. FILING DATE FIRST NAMED INVENTOR CONFIRMATION NO. 851-167.1 8714 10/613,354 07/03/2003 Dominic Paratore EXAMINER 4955 7590 05/19/2005 COMSTOCK, DAVID C WARE FRESSOLA VAN DER SLUYS & ADOLPHSON, LLP ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER **BRADFORD GREEN BUILDING 5** 755 MAIN STREET, P O BOX 224 3732 MONROE, CT 06468

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

			·
		Application No.	Applicant(s)
		10/613,354	PARATORE ET AL.
	Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit
		David Comstock	3732
Period f	The MAILING DATE of this communication app or Reply	pears on the cover shee	t with the correspondence address
THE - Extra afte - If th - If N - Fail Any	MORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. ensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 r SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. e period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply operiod for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period of the unit of the period for reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing ned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	36(a). In no event, however, may within the statutory minimum of will apply and will expire SIX (6) for a cause the application to become	y a reply be timely filed thirty (30) days will be considered timely. MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. B ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
Status			
1)[\]	Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>07 M</u>	<u>larch 2005</u> .	•
2a)□	This action is FINAL . 2b)⊠ This	action is non-final.	
3)	Since this application is in condition for allowar closed in accordance with the practice under E	·	• •
Disposi	tion of Claims		
4)⊠ 5)□ 6)⊠ 7)⊠ 8)□		wn from consideration.	
Applicat	ion Papers		
10)⊠	The specification is objected to by the Examine The drawing(s) filed on <u>03 July 2003</u> is/are: a) Applicant may not request that any objection to the Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex	☑ accepted or b)☐ ob drawing(s) be held in abe ion is required if the draw	yance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a). ing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
Priority	under 35 U.S.C. § 119		
a)	Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents 2. Certified copies of the priority documents 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority application from the International Bureau See the attached detailed Office action for a list	s have been received. s have been received in ity documents have be u (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	n Application No en received in this National Stage

Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)

Paper No(s)/Mail Date ___

4) 🗌	Interview Summary (PTO-413)
	Paper No(s)/Mail Date

5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

6) Other: _____.

Application/Control Number: 10/613,354

Art Unit: 3732

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

- (a) the invention was known or used by others in this country, or patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country, before the invention thereof by the applicant for a patent.
- (b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 1-8, 11, 15-18 and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Driesen et al. (6,141,819).

Driesen et al. disclose a brush 45 comprising twisted or braided fibers 1 extending from the brush in supportive interengagement (see, e.g., Figs. 1a, 2a, 3a, 4, 5 and 6; col. 4, lines 21-65; and col. 5, line 56 - col. 6, line 6). The bristles comprise a relatively stiff support fiber and less stiff additional fibers (see, e.g. Fig. 2b). The fibers are of different materials, diameters, and stiffnesses. The fibers may be polymer and have a diameter of .003 inch. The fibers may be enveloped in a hollow support fiber 22. The fibers may comprise spiral fibers and/or braided fibers. The brush is at least capable of being used to apply cosmetics if so desired.

Art Unit: 3732

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 9, 10, 13, 14 and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Driesen.

Driesen discloses the claimed invention except for the fibers being formed of a micofiber material. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to form the fibers of a microfiber material or of any of numerous other known materials, since it has been held to be within the general skill of a worker in the art to select a known material on the basis of its suitability for the intended use as a matter of obvious design choice. *In re Leshin*, 125 USPQ 416. It also would have been obvious to provide the support fiber with a diameter in the range of .005 to .020 inches and to provide the other fibers with diameters of .001 inches or diameters in the range of .0005 to .0015 inches, since it has been held that where the general conditions of a claim are disclosed in the prior art, discovering the optimum or workable ranges involves only routine skill in the art. *In re Aller*, 105 USPQ 233.

Art Unit: 3732

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-9 have been considered but are most in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Allowable Subject Matter

Claim 12 is objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to David Comstock whose telephone number is (571) 272-4710. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Art Unit: 3732

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

œ

D. Comstock 15 May 2005

KEVIN SHAYER

SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 3700